



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Compliance and Enforcement
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1
5 Post Office Square - Suite 100
Boston, MA 02109-3912

WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEM COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

**GREATER NEW HAVEN WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT**

FINAL INSPECTION REPORT

**Inspection Dates:
December 16 – 18, 2013**

**Report Date:
February 18, 2014**

(This page intentionally left blank.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. KEY FINDINGS.....	4
III. BACKGROUND.....	4
IV. ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH PERMIT REQUIREMENTS	6
Finding 1: Occurrence of Dry Weather Overflows (DWOs) from the GNHWPCA’s wastewater collection system	10
Finding 2: Potential unreported and unpermitted discharges (i.e., SSOs) have occurred in the GNHWPCA’s wastewater collection system.....	11
a. Instances of potential unreported and unauthorized discharges.....	11
b. Failure to report bypasses of GNHWPCA’s wastewater collection system within required timeframes	13
c. Inadequate system for recording and reporting bypasses.....	14
Finding 3: Failure to develop and/or implement a formal operations and maintenance program	15
-GNHWPCA lacks written SOPs for common activities, such as cleaning and inspections, and a lack of documentation for daily activities.	16
-GNHWPCA lacks a formal training program for collection system activities, including no written training program, no training manuals, and no employee training records.	16
-GNHWPCA lacks a comprehensive, large-diameter pipe cleaning program.	16
-GNHWPCA lacks a formal program for force main inspections and procedures for specific maintenance.	16
- GNHWPCA lacks SOPs, training, and documentation for identifying or removing “hot spots” from the developed lists of frequent pipe segment cleaning.....	16
Finding 4: Failure to provide adequate backup or auxiliary power or appurtenances for the Truman CSO Storage Tank.....	16
Finding 5: Failure to regularly inspect and maintain CSO regulators	17
Finding 6: Failure to adequately maintain pump station in accordance with routine preventative maintenance procedures.....	17
Finding 7: Failure to notify Commissioner of changes, alterations, and/or eliminations of CSO designations	18
V. ASSETS VISITED	19

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Greater New Haven WPCA NPDES Permit No. CT0100366
Appendix B:	Inspection Attendance Log Sign-in Sheet
Appendix C1:	Dry Weather Overflow at CSO 003 on August 14, 2012
Appendix C2:	Dry Weather Overflow at CSO 009 on January 25, 2013
Appendix C3:	Dry Weather Overflow at CSO 012 on March 1, 2013
Appendix D1:	CH2M Hill Customer Service Plan SOP
Appendix D2:	Customer Service Request Log (January 2012 – December 2013)
Appendix D3:	CT DEEP Bypass Query Greater New Haven January 2012 – December 2013
Appendix D4:	CT DEEP Bypass Report Forms
Appendix D5:	GNHWPCA Overflow Emergency Response Plan and SSO Response Procedures
Appendix E1:	GNHWPCA Hot-spot List for East Haven
Appendix E2:	GNHWPCA Hot-spot List for Hamden
Appendix E3:	GNHWPCA Hot-spot List for New Haven
Appendix E4:	GNHWPCA Hot-spot List for Woodbridge
Appendix F:	GNHWPCA Pump Station Summary
Appendix G:	Excerpt from GNHWPCA LTCP and NMC Report
Appendix H:	East Street Pump Station Weekly Preventative Maintenance Schedule and December 9, 2013 Completed Preventative Maintenance Work Order
Appendix I:	CSO Designations
Appendix J:	CSO Regulator 031 Closure and Citizen Complaint
Appendix K:	Photograph Log

(This page intentionally left blank.)

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 16 – 18, 2013 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with assistance from PG Environmental, LLC (PG), an EPA contractor, and the State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP) inspected the Greater New Haven Water Pollution Control Authority's (GNHWPCA's) wastewater collection and conveyance system. The EPA Inspection Team (composed of EPA and PG staff) assessed the GNHWPCA's operation and maintenance of the wastewater collection and conveyance system, as well as combined sewer overflow (CSO) and sanitary sewer overflow (SSO) response and reporting procedures. The EPA Inspection Team evaluated compliance with GNHWPCA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Wastewater Discharge Permit No. CT0100366 (Permit) and the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS). Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the Permit. The inspection consisted of the following major activities:

- Discussions with representatives from the GNHWPCA regarding the operations and maintenance of the wastewater collection and conveyance system, SSO response and reporting procedures, collections system drawings and manuals, and capital improvement program.
- Observation of the wastewater collection system field crew activities.
- A physical inspection of the GNHWPCA's regulators, combined sewer outfalls (CSOs), and pump stations.
- An examination of the GNHWPCA's wastewater collection system operations, maintenance, and SSO response and reporting records.

This report summarizes the results of the inspection. The following personnel were involved in the inspection of the GNHWPCA's wastewater collection and conveyance system (refer to Appendix B for the inspection attendance log sign-in sheets):

GNHWPCA Representatives:

Sidney Holbrook, Executive Director
Gary Zrelak, Director of Operations
Thomas Sgroi, P.E., Director of Engineering
Bruce Kirkland, P.E., Senior Engineer
Gabriel Varca, Director of Finance and Administration
Rick Hurlburt, Collections Superintendent
Jane Stahl, Consultant

John Torre, Project Manager, CH2M Hill
Kevin Dahl, P.E., Regional Business Manager, CH2M Hill
Christian Smith, Maintenance Manager, CH2M Hill
Scott Carr, Maintenance Manager, CH2M Hill
Rich Nasse, Collections Lead Operator, CH2M Hill
Jessie Whitmore, Industrial Pretreatment Coordinator, CH2M Hill

City of New Haven Representative:

Larry Smith, Acting City Engineer

EPA Inspection Team:

Neil Handler, EPA Region 1
John Melcher, EPA Region 1
Stacy Pappano, Sanitary Engineer, CT DEEP
Craig Motasky, Environmental Analyst, CT DEEP
Craig Blett, PG Environmental, LLC

Jared Richardson, PG Environmental, LLC

Section II of this report presents the EPA Inspection Team's key findings with respect to Permit requirements. Section III presents background information on GNHWPCA's wastewater collection and conveyance system and wastewater pollution abatement facility (WPAF). Section IV presents the assessment of compliance with Permit requirements.

II. KEY FINDINGS

The EPA Inspection Team conducted an extensive review of the GNHWPCA's performance in operating and maintaining its wastewater collection system and its CSO and SSO response and reporting procedures. The EPA Inspection Team identified a number of key findings during the inspection, which are summarized below:

- The GNHWPCA experienced reported and possible unreported dry weather overflows (DWOs) from the combined sewer portion of its wastewater collection system.
- The GNHWPCA experienced potential unreported and unpermitted discharges (i.e., SSOs) from its wastewater collection system.
- The GNHWPCA did not adequately report SSOs from its wastewater collection system.
- The GNHWPCA lacked the development and implementation of a formal operation and maintenance program for its wastewater collection system, including lack of standard operating procedures (SOPs), training, a large-diameter pipe cleaning program, and a force main inspection program. The GNHWPCA also failed to regularly inspect and maintain CSO regulators and to maintain pump stations.

Refer to the Section IV of this report for specific details.

III. BACKGROUND

The GNHWPCA is authorized to operate the wastewater collection system and discharge under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CT0100366 (Permit) and the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS). The GNHWPCA, which was created in August 2005 through a regional public authority, pursuant to §§22a-500 to 22a-519 of the CGS, serves a population of approximately 199,780 people.

The GNHWPCA has contracted with CH2M Hill, Operation Management International, Inc. (hereafter CH2M Hill) to operate and maintain the wastewater collection and conveyance system, pump stations, and WPAF. CH2M Hill, through its contract, has responsibility for: 1) wastewater collection system maintenance, repair and minor rehabilitation; 2) SSO response and reporting; 3) the operation and maintenance of the WPAF and all pump stations; and 4) implementation of the industrial pretreatment program. As part of the contract, CH2M Hill was responsible for routine cleaning of all sanitary and combined sewer mains and manholes at a minimum frequency of once every three years. Routine construction and repairs are funded by CH2M Hill up to an annual allowance agreed upon by CH2M Hill and the GNHWPCA each year. Repair costs above the allowance are reimbursed by the GNHWPCA. The GNHWPCA is responsible for funding, designing, and managing capital projects for the wastewater collection and conveyance system. Both GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill employees were present during the inspection as the primary representatives for the GNHWPCA.

The contract with CH2M Hill was due to expire on January 3, 2014, and the GNHWPCA was not planning to renew the contract. As a result, and as discussed in greater detail later in this section, the GNHWPCA is planning to take over many of the operation and maintenance activities that were previously part of the CH2M Hill contract. The GNHWPCA also contracts with Synagro Technologies, Inc. to operate the onsite incinerator used for sludge disposal.

The East Shore WPAF treats wastewater generated from four member communities including the City of New Haven and the towns of Hamden, East Haven, and Woodbridge. The WPAF also provides treatment for a small portion of North Branford sewer customers through an agreement with the town. The WPAF discharges to New Haven Harbor and is the second largest wastewater treatment plant in Connecticut, as provided on the GNHWPCA's website.

The East Shore WPAF provides primary and secondary treatment for flows up to 60 million gallons per day (mgd). Under wet weather conditions, the facility can provide primary treatment for flows of up to 100 mgd. GNHWPCA representatives stated that the average daily flow at the treatment plant is approximately 29 mgd. Typical dry-weather treatment consists of primary treatment, secondary activated sludge treatment with some biological nitrogen removal, chlorine disinfection, and dechlorination. During wet weather and effluent flows up to 100 mgd, flows above 60 mgd bypass secondary treatment and are combined with treated secondary effluent prior to chlorination and discharge. During bypass conditions, the maximum daily limits established in the Permit for TSS and BOD are waived. Permit compliance is measured in the blended flow.

According to GNHWPCA representatives, a plant upgrade project is being planned to add a wet-weather treatment train that will increase the primary treatment capacity at the facility to 187 mgd. The project will also provide a new electrical system, add backup generators, provide sludge storage and thickening, add enhanced nitrogen reduction, and construct a new odor control system. The WPAF was not evaluated as a component of the inspection.

The GNHWPCA's wastewater collection and conveyance system is a blend of separate sewers and combined sewers. During wet weather, combined sewers are designed to transport both sanitary waste flows and stormwater to the WPAF. Flows which exceed the GNHWPCA capacity of the combined sewer are discharged through permitted combined sewer outfalls (CSOs) to various receiving waters. Separate sewers are designed to transport only sanitary waste.

Wastewater is conveyed via approximately 490 miles of sanitary sewer lines, approximately 70 miles of combined sewer lines, 30 pump stations, and 8 siphons/pressure sewers to the East Shore WPAF. Under the contract in place at the time of inspection, CH2M Hill also was responsible for the maintenance and operation of GNHWPCA's 18 permitted CSOs (14 active, 4 closed) and approximately 24 CSO regulators (19 active, 5 closed) which, during high flow conditions, divert excess flows and discharge them to the New Haven Harbor, Quinnipiac River, Mill River, and West River. GNHWPCA has reportedly installed continuous flow monitoring devices on all active CSOs as of June 2012, as a result of a CWA Section 308 Information Request Letter sent by EPA on February 14, 2012. CSO flow metering services are provided under contract with CSL Services, Inc.

A CSO control facility was constructed as part of the GNHWPCA's long-term efforts to control CSO discharges. The Truman CSO Storage Tank, a 5-million-gallon, two-cell storage tank, was constructed in 2006 at a cost of approximately \$23 million to maximize flows in the combined sewer system. A portion of wet weather flows in the Boulevard Trunk Sewer can be siphoned off and stored in the tank, then pumped back to the Boulevard Trunk Sewer once dry weather flow resumes. The original concept behind the installation of the tank was to be able to move excess flows from a 2-year design storm to the tank for storage and later feed it back into the collection system for treatment. The GNHWPCA is planning to update their collection system hydraulic model and their Long Term Control Plan.

GNHWPCA does not own, operate, or maintain storm drainage systems (i.e., catch basins). These components as well as the implementation of the General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater from Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems issued by CT DEEP (MS4 Permit) are the responsibility of the City of New Haven. The GNHWPCA does not own any park lands or public spaces, school or government properties, or City of New Haven right-of-ways.

GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives informed the EPA Inspection Team that GNHWPCA's 15-year contract with CH2M Hill expires on January 3, 2014. GNHWPCA is not planning to reissue the contract to CH2M Hill and instead plans to assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the wastewater collection and treatment system. GNHWPCA is also planning to issue a separate new contract for the cleaning of the collection system in early 2014. GNHWPCA staff will reportedly inspect the wastewater collection system and perform "hot spot" responses but other areas identified for regular cleaning and maintenance would be part of this new contract. Synagro will continue to be involved with the operation of the incinerator and will also assume additional responsibilities for performing maintenance of the pump stations and the WPAF.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

The EPA Inspection Team was tasked with assessing the operations and maintenance of the GNHWPCA's wastewater collection and conveyance system. The EPA Inspection Team identified and documented several findings that are related to the GNHWPCA's compliance with its NPDES Permit. These findings are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Summary of Findings

Findings	Permit/Regulatory References
Reporting and Recordkeeping	
<p>Finding 1: Occurrence of DWOs from the GNHWPCA's wastewater collection system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. DWO at CSO 003 on August 14, 2012. b. DWO at CSO 009 on January 25, 2013. c. DWO at CSO 012 on March 1, 2013. 	<p>SECTION 8, RECORDING AND REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS, ADDITIONAL TESTING REQUIREMENTS, BYPASSES, MECHANICAL FAILURES, AND MONITORING EQUIPMENT FAILURES, (C) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(k) (1), Bypass, of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA)</p> <p><i>"The Permittee shall not at any time bypass the collection system or treatment facilities or any part thereof unless (A) (i) such bypass is unanticipated, unavoidable, and necessary to prevent loss of life, personal injury or severe property damage, and (ii) there were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, including but not limited to the use of auxiliary or back-up treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, stopping the discharges, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime; or (B) the Permittee receives prior written approval of the bypass from the commissioner in order to perform essential maintenance, and the bypass does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded."</i></p> <p>SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A) of the Permit requires:</p> <p><i>"The Permittee shall use, to the maximum extent practicable, available sewerage system transportation capabilities for the conveyance of combined sewage to treatment facilities. The Permittee is authorized to discharge combined sewage flows from combined sewer overflow outfalls listed in Attachment 3 in response to wet weather flow, i.e. rainfall or snowmelt conditions, when total available transportation, treatment and storage capabilities are exceeded."</i></p> <p>SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A)(1)(a)</p>

Findings	Permit/Regulatory References
<p>Finding 2: Potential unreported and unpermitted discharges (i.e., SSOs) have occurred in the GNHWPCA's wastewater collection system</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seven instances of potential unreported and unauthorized discharges (i.e., SSOs), during period of review. Four instances, during period of review, of SSOs not reported to CT DEEP within 2 hours of the Permittee learning of the event. GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill's computerized maintenance and management system (CMMS), Maintenance Connection[®], was not being utilized effectively to ensure that work orders generated for sanitary sewer overflows were adequately tracked, responded to, and closed out. 	<p>of the Permit states:</p> <p><i>"Dry weather overflows are prohibited."</i></p> <p>SECTION 8, RECORDING AND REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS, ADDITIONAL TESTING REQUIREMENTS, BYPASSES, MECHANICAL FAILURES, AND MONITORING EQUIPMENT FAILURES, (C) and SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A)(1)(a) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(k) (4), Bypass, of the RCSA.</p> <p>Section 8 (C) of the Permit states:</p> <p><i>"The Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse, Planning and Standards Division, Municipal Facilities Section (860) 424-3704, the Department of Public Health, Water Supply Section (860) 509-7333 and Recreation Section (860) 509-7297, and the local Director of Health shall be notified within 2 hours of the Permittee learning of the event by telephone during normal business hours. If the discharge or bypass occurs outside normal working hours (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday), notification shall be made within 2 hours of the Permittee learning of the event to the Emergency Response Unit at (860) 424-3338 and the Department of Public Health at (860) 509-8000. A written report shall be submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse, Planning and Standards Division, Municipal Facilities Section within five days of the Permittee learning of each occurrence, or potential occurrence, of a discharge or bypass of untreated or partially treated sewage."</i></p> <p>Section 9 (A)(1)(a) of the Permit states:</p> <p><i>"During wet weather flows, the Permittee is authorized to discharge stormwater/wastewater from combined sewer outfalls listed in Attachment 3. Dry weather overflows are prohibited. Any other discharge from the outfalls listed in Attachment 3 constitutes a bypass and is subject to the requirements of Section 8 of this permit."</i></p> <p>Section 22a-430-3(k) (4), Bypass, of the RCSA states:</p> <p><i>"If any bypass occurs or may occur, the Permittee shall, within two hours of becoming aware of such condition or need, notify the director during normal business hours (566-3245), and the department's Emergency Response Unit at all other times (566-3338) and submit within five days a written report including the cause of the problem, duration including dates and times and corrective action taken or planned to prevent other such occurrences."</i></p>
Operation and Maintenance	
<p>Finding 3: Failure to develop and/or implement a formal operations and maintenance program</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GNHWPCA lacks SOPs, written forms, and documentation for 	<p>SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(h) Duty to Mitigate and Section 22a-430-3(f) Proper Operation and Maintenance of the RCSA.</p>

Findings	Permit/Regulatory References
<p>collection system activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. GNHWPCA lacks a formal training program for collection system activities, including not having a training manual or documentation of training activities. c. GNHWPCA lacks an effective, large-diameter collection system cleaning program. d. GNHWPCA lacks a formal program for force main inspections and operation and maintenance. e. GNHWPCA lacks SOPs, training, and documentation for identifying or removing “hot spots” from the wastewater collection system. f. GNHWPCA lacks an easement maintenance program. 	<p>Section 22a-430-3(h), Duty to Mitigate, of the RCSA states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit or any discharge which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.”</i></p> <p>Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems and parts thereof for wastewater collection, storage, treatment and control which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes but is not limited to effective performance, adequate funding, and adequate operator staffing and training, including the employment of certified operators as may be required by the commissioner pursuant to sections 22a-416-1 through 22a-416-10 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. The commissioner shall, as a condition of a permit or by issuance of an order in accordance with sections 22a-416 through 22a-471 of the Connecticut General Statutes as amended, require the installation and operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems or the inventory of spare parts and appurtenances.”</i></p>
<p>Finding 4: Failure to provide adequate backup or auxiliary power or appurtenances for the Truman CSO Storage Tank.</p>	<p>SECTION 4, GENERAL LIMITATIONS AND OTHER CONDITIONS, (G) of the Permit, SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) and Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA.</p> <p>SECTION 4(G) of the Permit states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall maintain an alternate power source adequate to provide full operation of all pump stations in the sewerage collection system and to provide a minimum of primary treatment and disinfection at the water pollution control facility to insure that no discharge of untreated wastewater will occur during a failure of a primary power source.”</i></p> <p>Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems and parts thereof for wastewater collection, storage, treatment and control which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes but is not limited to effective performance, adequate funding, and adequate operator staffing and training, including the employment of certified operators as may be required by the commissioner pursuant to sections 22a-416-1 through 22a-416-10 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. The commissioner</i></p>

Findings	Permit/Regulatory References
	<p><i>shall, as a condition of a permit or by issuance of an order in accordance with sections 22a-416 through 22a-471 of the Connecticut General Statutes as amended, require the installation and operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems or the inventory of spare parts and appurtenances.”</i></p>
<p>Finding 5: Failure to inspect and maintain CSO regulators on a monthly basis in accordance with the LTCP and associated NMCs report.</p>	<p>SECTION 4, GENERAL LIMITATIONS AND OTHER CONDITIONS, (O) of the Permit, SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(h) Duty to Mitigate of the RCSA.</p> <p>SECTION 4(O) of the Permit states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall operate and maintain all processes as installed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and as outlined in the associated operation and maintenance manual.”</i></p> <p>Section 22a-430-3(h) Duty to Mitigate of the RCSA states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit or any discharge which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.”</i></p>
<p>Finding 6: Failure to adequately maintain pump station in accordance with routine and preventative maintenance procedures.</p>	<p>SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA.</p> <p>Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA states:</p> <p><i>“The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems and parts thereof for wastewater collection, storage, treatment and control which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes but is not limited to effective performance, adequate funding, and adequate operator staffing and training, including the employment of certified operators as may be required by the commissioner pursuant to sections 22a-416-1 through 22a-416-10 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. The commissioner shall, as a condition of a permit or by issuance of an order in accordance with sections 22a-416 through 22a-471 of the Connecticut General Statutes as amended, require the installation and operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems or the inventory of spare parts and appurtenances.”</i></p>
Combined Sewer Overflows	
<p>Finding 7: Failure to notify Commissioner of changes, alterations, and/or eliminations of CSO designations.</p>	<p>SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A) of the Permit states:</p> <p><i>“The locations of outfalls and regulators listed in Attachment 3 are taken from Department records. Any information on the locations of any outfalls and regulators in addition to or in conflict with the information in Attachment 3 shall be submitted to</i></p>

Findings	Permit/Regulatory References
	<i>the Commissioner within 30 days of the date of issuance of this permit or the date the Permittee becomes aware of such information, whichever is earlier.”</i>

Details for each finding of potential noncompliance are provided below.

Finding 1: Occurrence of Dry Weather Overflows (DWOs) from the GNHWPCA’s wastewater collection system

Based on a document review conducted by the EPA Inspection Team as a component of this inspection, DWOs were found to have occurred at several of the GNHWPCA’s CSO outfall locations.

Section 22a-430-3(k) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA) and SECTION 9 (A)(1)(a) of the Permit prohibit such events.

. Section 22a-430-3(k) shall apply in all instances of bypass, including bypass of the treatment plant or a component of the sewage collection system. This section states:

“The Permittee shall not at any time bypass the collection system or treatment facilities or any part thereof unless (A) (i) such bypass is unanticipated, unavoidable, and necessary to prevent loss of life, personal injury or severe property damage, and (ii) there were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, including but not limited to the use of auxiliary or back-up treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, stopping the discharges, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime; or (B) the Permittee receives prior written approval of the bypass from the commissioner in order to perform essential maintenance, and the bypass does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded.”

SECTION 9 (A) of the Permit states:

“The Permittee is authorized to discharge combined sewage flows from combined sewer overflow outfalls listed in Attachment 3 in response to wet weather flow, i.e. rainfall or snowmelt conditions, when total available transportation, treatment and storage capabilities are exceeded.”

SECTION 9 (A)(1)(a) of the Permit states:

“Dry weather overflows are prohibited.”

The EPA Inspection Team found, based on GNHWPCA records reviewed, that GNHWPCA had reported an unauthorized discharge of wastewater from the CSO 003 location during August 14–16, 2012. Specifically, a DWO of wastewater was reported by GNHWPCA from CSO 003, located at E.T.G. Boulevard and Orange Avenue, on August 14, 2012. The root cause of the overflow was documented and reported as a failure of a brick weir wall, and the estimated quantity/volume of the bypass was 1.2 million gallons, which discharged to the West River. Refer to Appendix C1 for GNHWPCA’s CT DEEP bypass reporting forms and associated work order documentation for this DWO event.

The EPA Inspection Team found, based on GNHWPCA records reviewed, that GNHWPCA had reported an unauthorized discharge of wastewater, discovered on January 25, 2013, from the CSO 009 location. The discharge lasted until January 26, 2013. Specifically, a DWO of wastewater was reported by GNHWPCA from CSO 009, located at Grand Avenue and James Street, on January 25, 2013. The root

cause of the overflow was documented and reported as a failure of a brick weir wall, and the estimated quantity/volume of the bypass was 25,000 gallons, which discharged to the Mill River. Refer to Appendix C2 for GNHWPCA's CT DEEP bypass reporting forms and associated CSO flow monitoring report summary table for this DWO event. It should also be noted that GNHWPCA's January 2013 CSO flow monitoring report summary table for CSO 009 was missing data and/or did not identify activation of the CSO flow meter from January 18–27, 2013, a time period including the DWO event.

The EPA Inspection Team found, based on GNHWPCA records reviewed, that GNHWPCA had an unauthorized discharge of wastewater from the CSO 012 location during March 1–7, 2013. Specifically, a DWO of wastewater occurred from CSO 012, located at 75 Mitchell Drive east of Nicoll Street. Discussions with GNHWPCA representatives indicated the root cause of the overflow was an inadequate CSO weir wall height. The estimated quantity/volume of the bypass was 2.08 million gallons, which discharged to the Mill River. It should be noted that this did not appear to have been reported in accordance with Section 8 of the Permit. Refer to Appendix C3 for GNHWPCA's CSO flow monitoring report summary table for this DWO event.

Finding 2: Potential unreported and unpermitted discharges (i.e., SSOs) have occurred in the GNHWPCA's wastewater collection system

a. Instances of potential unreported and unauthorized discharges

A document review conducted by the EPA Inspection Team as a component of this inspection indicated that GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill are not implementing an adequate process for recording and reporting wastewater overflows of the collection and conveyance system. Section 22a-430-3(k)(1) of the RCSA and SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A)(1)(a) of the Permit prohibit such events.

Section 22a-430-3(k) shall apply in all instances of bypass including bypass of the treatment plant or a component of the sewage collection system. This section states:

“The Permittee shall not at any time bypass the collection system or treatment facilities or any part thereof unless (A) (i) such bypass is unanticipated, unavoidable, and necessary to prevent loss of life, personal injury or severe property damage, and (ii) there were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, including but not limited to the use of auxiliary or back-up treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, stopping the discharges, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime; or (B) the Permittee receives prior written approval of the bypass from the commissioner in order to perform essential maintenance, and the bypass does not cause effluent limitations to be exceeded.”

SECTION 9 (A)(1)(a) of the Permit states:

“Any other discharge from the outfalls listed in Attachment 3 constitutes a bypass and is subject to the requirements of Section 8 of this permit. “

The EPA Inspection Team found, based on a spot check of GNHWPCA customer service request logs (January 2, 2012 through December 2, 2013) cross referenced with CT DEEP bypass reports (January 2, 2012 through December 12, 2013), that seven instances of potential unreported and unpermitted discharges (i.e., SSOs) had occurred. Refer to highlighted sections of the customer service request log documentation (Appendix D2) and the CT DEEP Bypass Query Greater New Haven January 2012 through December 2013 provided in Appendix D3. Note the highlighted customer service log requests provided in Appendix D2 are not identified on the CT DEEP bypass reports query log provided in Appendix D3, potentially indicating that these SSOs had not been reported as required by the Permit.

Events from the GNHWPCA customer service request logs that might have been unreported SSOs occurred at the locations listed below in Table 2.

Table 2. List of Possible Unreported SSO Events

Date and Time	Reason/Location	Notes
1/10/2012 @ 14:04	Sewer Backup @ 164 SE	Crew checked the city line, was backed up. The crew jetted the line and restored flow. The DEEP was notified and Pro Klean contracted to clean and sanitize. A homeowner estimate of spill was 10 gallons of sewage in the basement.
2/06/2012 @ 15:37	Sewer Backup @ 220 Hunt Lane East	Crew responded to a backup complaint. The line was backed up in the right of way behind 220 hunt lane. The flow was restored. The next morning the crew went back to finish cleaning the line. McVac was contracted to clean the manhole in the woods. OMI did not have the hose to reach the manhole. The manhole was pumped down and cleaned out. An old telephone was removed from the invert and two pieces of wood. The line was jetted again. Lyme was applied to the affected area. The deep was notified.
2/12/2012 @ 11:07	Sewer Backup, Basement Flooded	Crew checked the city line, was ok. The owner needs a plumber. Crew checked the city line, was backed up. The crew jetted the line and restored flow. The owner had no spill in the basement. The owner had contacted a plumber to clear her line. She was instructed to contact the superintendent's office in the morning about the bill. The owner called about the plumbers bill and asked to have the basement sanitized. There was no spill to pick up, the tenants kept up with the backup. See all attachments including Pro Klean invoice.
3/05/2012 @ 13:41	Sewer Backup, Chris Mc	Crew checked the city line, was surcharged. The crew jetted the line and restored flow. The DEEP was notified and Pro Klean contracted to clean and sanitize. Rick was notified due to the owner wanting to make a claim that didn't sound right. Shop rags and what looked like a shop rags were cleared from the line.
7/26/2012 @ 14:25	Basement Flooded @ 65 George Street, Hamden	The crew checked the city line, was holding some water. The crew jetted the line to help the owner with his problem. The crew stated that when water was used in the upstairs apartment, the water ran out from the wall in the basement. The owner has a plumbing problem.
9/26/2012 @ 13:16	Sewer Backup @ 13 Glen Haven Road	Water backing up into sinks in basement. The crew found the line surcharged with

Date and Time	Reason/Location	Notes
		heavy grease. The crew jetted the line and restored flow. The homeowner had water back up in a basement sink. The Owner had cleaned the sink. There was no spill on the floor. Rick spoke to the homeowner and told them we would do a follow up work order and let them know what was found.
4/01/2013 @ 10:12	Sewage out of manhole 331B	Heavy roots in line. The last manhole over is buried. The manhole cover outline is visible in the pavement. The road was wet around the outline of the manhole. The line was jetted and roots were removed. The crew will go back and open the cover and do a follow up cleaning. There were no homes affected.

In the context of NPDES Permit No. CT0100366, a bypass in the collection system is synonymous with EPA's definition of an SSO.

“Sanitary Sewer Overflow” or “SSO” shall mean any overflow, spill, diversion, or release of wastewater from, or caused by, the Collection System. SSOs include, but are not limited to, discharges to waters of the United States from the Collection System, as well as any release of wastewater from the Collection System to public or private property that does not reach waters of the United States, including wastewater backups onto public streets, into buildings, or onto private property.

b. Failure to report bypasses of GNHWPCA's wastewater collection system within required timeframes

The EPA Inspection Team found, based on a spot check of GNHWPCA's "Bypass Report" forms during the period of review, January 2011 through December 2013, four instances in which GNHWPCA did not notify CT DEEP within two hours of becoming aware of the bypass. Documentation and reporting information for these bypasses is included in Appendix D4.

SECTION 8, RECORDING AND REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS, ADDITIONAL TESTING REQUIREMENTS, BYPASSES, MECHANICAL FAILURES, AND MONITORING EQUIPMENT FAILURES, (C) and SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A)(1)(a) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(k) (4), Bypass, of the RCSA. Section 8 (C) states:

“The Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse, Planning and Standards Division, Municipal Facilities Section (860) 424-3704, the Department of Public Health, Water Supply Section (860) 509-7333 and Recreation Section (860) 509-7297, and the local Director of Health shall be notified within 2 hours of the Permittee learning of the event by telephone during normal business hours. If the discharge or bypass occurs outside normal working hours (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday), notification shall be made within 2 hours of the Permittee learning of the event to the Emergency Response Unit at (860) 424-3338 and the Department of Public Health at (860) 509-8000. A written report shall be submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse, Planning and Standards Division, Municipal Facilities Section within five days of the Permittee learning of each occurrence, or potential occurrence, of a discharge or bypass of untreated or partially treated sewage.

The written report shall contain:

- (a) The nature and cause of the bypass, permit violation, treatment component failure, and/or equipment failure,*
- (b) The time the incident occurred and the anticipated time which it is expected to continue or, if the condition has been corrected, the duration,*
- (c) The estimated volume of the bypass or discharge of partially treated or raw sewage,*
- (d) The steps being taken to reduce or minimize the effect on receiving waters, and*
- (e) The steps that will be taken to prevent reoccurrence of the condition in the future.”*

SECTION 9 (A)(1)(a) of the Permit states:

“During wet weather flows, the Permittee is authorized to discharge stormwater/wastewater from combined sewer outfalls listed in Attachment 3. Dry weather overflows are prohibited. Any other discharge from the outfalls listed in Attachment 3 constitutes a bypass and is subject to the requirements of Section 8 of this permit. “Section 22a-430-3(k) (4), Bypass, of the RCSA states:

“If any bypass occurs or may occur, the Permittee shall, within two hours of becoming aware of such condition or need, notify the director during normal business hours (566-3245), and the department’s Emergency Response Unit at all other times (566-3338) and submit within five days a written report including the cause of the problem, duration including dates and times and corrective action taken or planned to prevent other such occurrences.”

Events from GNHWPCA’s Bypass Report Forms in which the CT DEEP were not notified within two hours of becoming aware of the bypass are listed below in Table 3. Documentation and reporting information for these bypasses is included in Appendix D4.

Table 3. Bypass events not reported within required timeframe

Date and Time Bypass Discovered	Date and Time CT DEEP Notified	Within Required 2 Hour Timeframe (Yes/No)
3/27/2011 @ 09:10 PM	Not documented	No
5/05/2011 @ 02:15 PM	Not documented	No
7/21/2011 @ 08:30 AM	7/21/2011 @ 10:55 AM	No, 25 minutes beyond timeframe
8/29/2011 @ 11:45 AM	Not documented	No

c. Inadequate system for recording and reporting bypasses

The EPA Inspection Team found that the observed process for recordkeeping was not adequate and did not facilitate accurate recording and reporting of bypasses. The GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill were not following a written SOP for documenting incoming customer service requests. Refer to Appendix D1 for the CH2M Hill Customer Service Plan SOP dated April 2, 2008. Discussions with the plant operator who receives customer service calls revealed adequate training had not been provided and SOP procedures were not fully implemented.

It was found that notification procedures did not occur according to the CH2M Hill SOP. For example, the plant operator recorded customer calls on unbound pieces of scrap paper prior to entering the data into the CMMS. Based on the lack of a bound notebook or digital recordkeeping process, there was a potential for misplaced or unaddressed customer service requests and/or SSOs. In addition, the SOP stated, “[The] Plant notifies the collection crew during working hours and makes a decision on call-out of the collection crew during off-shifts in accordance with the following guidelines for reported blockages.” However,

discussions with the plant operator indicated this was not the current process implemented. As stated by the plant operator, GNHWPCA's director of operations determined the responsibility for and jurisdiction of the customer service request and authorized the generation of a work order, then notified collection systems crews accordingly. Due to the lack of following the SOP, customer service requests may potentially not generate a work order or be responded to by the collections crews and subsequently SSOs may not be adequately identified, remediated, and reported.

Importantly, the lack of training, based on the EPA Inspection Team's discussions with staff, and lack of a structured recordkeeping process may have a significant impact on the accuracy and reliability of GNHWPCA's compliance with Permit recording and reporting procedures.

The GNHWPCA did not maintain a structured and reliable process for maintaining forms and/or documentation of customer service requests and responses to bypasses from the collection system, or from bypass investigation and response activities. GNHWPCA utilizes the CMMS – Maintenance Connection[®] for generating work orders for customer service requests, preventative maintenance, and sewer system cleanings. The EPA Inspection Team found, based on discussions with staff, a lack of SOPs and training for CMMS entry, coding, work order generation, and work order closeout. Specifically, a requested query of the CMMS for open work orders for the collections system from 2010 to 2013 identified approximately 300 open work orders; a number of these were associated with unauthorized discharges (i.e., SSOs). As a result, there was a lack of continuity, traceability, and resolution among customer service requests, work orders, and bypass reporting information, which creates a potential for bypasses to be unreported.

The EPA Inspection Team also found a lack of formal training and procedures for collection system operators and crews. Collection system crews are dispatched with sewer system asset maps and equipment for preventative maintenance, cleaning, and/or bypass investigation and response. The crews document daily activities on written logs or checklists, but are not provided with the work order information, and have not been trained on GNHWPCA's *Overflow Emergency Response Plan and SSO Response Procedures*. These procedures are provided in Appendix D5. Based on discussions with collection system operators and field crews, the EPA Inspection Team found that these personnel were unaware of these procedures and had not received any formal training on the procedures. Field crews did not record their activities in a retrievable format, potentially causing data which could be used to analyze common issues or identify hot spots within the wastewater collection system to be lost. As a result, specific information required for CT DEEP bypass reporting may not be accurately obtained from the field.

Finding 3: Failure to develop and/or implement a formal operations and maintenance program

Based on discussions with GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives during the course of the inspection, the EPA Inspection Team observed that the GNHWPCA lacks a formal operations and maintenance program for the wastewater collection and conveyance system. The observations were made primarily through discussions with GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives. Specifically, GNHWPCA was unable to demonstrate that the following aspects of a maintenance program were implemented:

- GNHWPCA lacks written SOPs for common activities, such as cleaning and inspections, and a lack of documentation for daily activities.
- GNHWPCA lacks a formal training program for collection system activities, including no written training program, no training manuals, and no employee training records.
- GNHWPCA lacks a comprehensive, large-diameter pipe cleaning program.
- GNHWPCA lacks a formal program for force main inspections and procedures for specific maintenance.
- GNHWPCA lacks SOPs, training, and documentation for identifying or removing “hot spots” from the developed lists of frequent pipe segment cleaning.

GNHWPCA has identified a large number of hot spots, for reference refer to Appendices E1 through E4 for GNHWPCA’s hot-spot lists for East Haven, Hamden, New Haven, and Woodbridge, respectively.

SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) of the Permit and RCSA’s Section 22a-430-3(h), Duty to Mitigate, and Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, have been adopted by the CGS.

Section 22a-430-3(h), Duty to Mitigate, of the RCSA states:

“The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit or any discharge which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.”

Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA states:

“The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems and parts thereof for wastewater collection, storage, treatment and control which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes but is not limited to effective performance, adequate funding, and adequate operator staffing and training, including the employment of certified operators as may be required by the commissioner pursuant to sections 22a-416-1 through 22a-416-10 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. The commissioner shall, as a condition of a permit or by issuance of an order in accordance with sections 22a-416 through 22a-471 of the Connecticut General Statutes as amended, require the installation and operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems or the inventory of spare parts and appurtenances.”

Finding 4: Failure to provide adequate backup or auxiliary power or appurtenances for the Truman CSO Storage Tank

The EPA Inspection Team found, based on field observations and discussions with GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives, that the CSO control facility, the Truman CSO Storage Tank, did not have an alternate power source as required by Section 4(G) of the Permit.

SECTION 4, GENERAL LIMITATIONS AND OTHER CONDITIONS, (G) of the Permit states:

“The Permittee shall maintain an alternate power source adequate to provide full operation of all pump stations in the sewerage collection system and to provide a minimum of primary treatment and disinfection at the water pollution control facility to insure that no discharge of untreated wastewater will occur during a failure of a primary power source.”

The Truman CSO Storage Tank was constructed in 2006 by the GNHWPCA to control CSO discharges. Refer to Appendix I, Photograph 12 and Photograph 13. The tank consists of two cells, each with a volume of 2.5 million gallons. The two cells are connected via a flap valve. Following a wet weather event, and when flows at the Boulevard pump station and WPAF have subsided to dry weather conditions, two 3,500 gallon per minute (gpm), submersible pumps empty the storage tank, pumping the contents back to the Boulevard trunk sewer. Neither cell of the storage tank had pump redundancy, nor were spare pumps and equipment readily available to use in the event of a power outage or pump failure. A summary of all of the GNHWPCA's pump stations and those configured with auxiliary generators is provided in Appendix F.

Finding 5: Failure to regularly inspect and maintain CSO regulators

The EPA Inspection Team found that CSO regulators were not being inspected and maintained on a routine basis.

SECTION 4, GENERAL LIMITATIONS AND OTHER CONDITIONS, (O) of the Permit states:

“The Permittee shall operate and maintain all processes as installed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and as outlined in the associated operation and maintenance manual.”

SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(h), Duty to Mitigate, of the RCSA state:

“The Permittee shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge in violation of the permit or any discharge which has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment.”

Based on records reviewed and discussions with GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives, the EPA Inspection Team found that the (approximately) 24 CSO regulators in the wastewater collection system were not being routinely inspected. Specifically, the *Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) and Nine Minimum Controls (NMCs) Report* prepared by CH2M Hill, dated June 1998, stated that all overflow structures would be inspected once each month for the following: flows, weirs heights and flow levels, and physical condition. Refer to Appendix G for an excerpt from the LTCP, NMCs report; however, this was not being done. As a result, GNHWPCA had a reactive approach to identified issues with the CSO outfalls and regulators.

Finding 6: Failure to adequately maintain pump station in accordance with routine preventative maintenance procedures

The GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill had not adequately maintained the East Street pump station for proper operation nor did it appear that routine preventative maintenance procedures had been adequately implemented.

SECTION 1, GENERAL PROVISIONS, (B) of the Permit and Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA have been adopted by the CGS.

Section 22a-430-3(f), Proper Operation and Maintenance, of the RCSA states:

“The Permittee shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems and parts thereof for wastewater collection, storage, treatment and control which are installed or used by the Permittee to achieve compliance with the terms and conditions of the permit. Proper operation and maintenance includes but is not limited to effective performance, adequate funding, and adequate operator staffing and training, including the employment of certified operators as may be required by the commissioner pursuant to sections 22a-416-1 through 22a-416-10 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, as amended, and adequate laboratory and process controls, including appropriate quality assurance procedures. The commissioner shall, as a condition of a permit or by issuance of an order in accordance with sections 22a-416 through 22a-471 of the Connecticut General Statutes as amended, require the installation and operation of back-up or auxiliary facilities or similar systems or the inventory of spare parts and appurtenances.”

Based on a site visit to the East Street pump station and discussions with GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives, the EPA Inspection Team found that the pump station had not been adequately maintained. Specifically, only two of four grit collectors were in use at the time of the inspection and it was communicated to the EPA Inspection Team that wet weather events always caused the chain-driven grit collectors to require maintenance, necessitating pulling some of the grit removal system offline. It should be noted that no scheduled replacement is anticipated for these grit collectors. The grit removal system was observed to be deteriorated (e.g., rusted through) and raw sewage and sanitary waste were observed on the floor of the pump station adjacent to the grit removal conveyor belt during the inspection (refer to Appendix K, Photographs 2 and 3).

The weekly preventative maintenance schedule and most recent completed work order for weekly preventative maintenance at the East Street pump station were reviewed as a component of the inspection. It should be noted that this completed weekly preventative maintenance work order (MAINT-67056), dated December 9, 2013 (approximately one week prior to the inspection), documented that all preventative maintenance activities had been completed and no issues or corrective actions were identified. Work order items 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, and 101 stated that all debris were cleaned from around the conveyors, grit collectors were verified as in operation, and all pump station floors were swept; however, observations made during the inspection indicated that these activities may not have been implemented in the field. The East Street pump station weekly preventative maintenance schedule and completed work order MAINT-67056 are provided in Appendix H.

It is worth noting that the grit collectors were found to be in poor to very bad condition in the *Greater New Haven Water Pollution Control Authority Wastewater Treatment System Condition Assessment and Capital Program Report* prepared by Malcolm-Pirnie, dated January 2012, and based on inspections performed in September 2011.

Finding 7: Failure to notify Commissioner of changes, alterations, and/or eliminations of CSO designations

The GNHWPCA had failed to notify the Commissioner within 30 days of becoming aware of conflicts with the active CSO designations provided in Attachment 3 of the Permit.

SECTION 9, COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOWS, (A) of the Permit states:

“The locations of outfalls and regulators listed in Attachment 3 are taken from Department records. Any information on the locations of any outfalls and regulators in addition to or in conflict with the information in Attachment 3 shall be submitted to the

Commissioner within 30 days of the date of issuance of this permit or the date the Permittee becomes aware of such information, whichever is earlier.”

Attachment 3 of the Permit identified 34 active CSO locations. GNHWPCA representatives stated in discussions and in a presentation that there were 18 permitted CSOs (14 active, 4 closed) and 24 CSO regulators (19 active, 5 closed) at the time of the inspection. In the most recent status report provided to CT DEEP, the *CSO LTCP Annual Status Report*, dated June 20, 2013, GNHWPCA reported that there were 17 active CSO outfalls and 21 inactive / closed CSO outfalls, as well as 21 active CSO regulators and 24 inactive / closed CSO regulators. Attachment 3 of the Permit and GNHWPCA’s *CSO LTCP Annual Status Report* are provided in Appendix I.

In at least one case, GNHWPCA reported to CT DEEP that a CSO regulator was closed when it remained open. In the *CSO LTCP Annual Status Report*, dated June 20, 2013, GNHWPCA reported that regulator 031 was closed. Work orders provided by GNHWPCA indicate that the regulator was open when it was investigated on July 26, 2013, following a citizen complaint (included in Appendix J). Work orders provided by GNHWPCA indicate the regulator was closed on October 10, 2013 (refer to Appendix J).

V. ASSETS VISITED

The following table presents observations the EPA Inspection Team made at assets visited during the inspection. Note that this table does not provide a comprehensive list of all asset/locations visited during the inspection. The photograph log is provided in Appendix K.

Table 4. Summary of Observations at GNHWPCA Assets Visited

Asset/Location	Date of Inspection	Photo Log Reference	Observations/Description
East Street Pump Station	December 17, 2013	1, 2, 3, 4	Only two of four grit chambers were in use. Grit chambers No. 3 and No. 4 were observed to be offline for maintenance during the inspection. As stated by GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives, wet weather events always cause the chain-driven grit chambers to require maintenance. It should be noted that no scheduled replacement is anticipated for these grit chambers. The grit channels are connected to a supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system; however, the grit equipment must be manually activated. The grit removal system was deteriorated (e.g., rusted through) and raw sewage and sanitary waste were observed on the floor of the pump station adjacent to the grit removal conveyor belt.
CSO 021 Regulator and Outfall	December 17, 2013	5, 6, 7	CSO Regulator 021 and CSO Outfall 021 near the East Street pump station were observed. A flow meter was observed in the regulator was observed and a newly installed tidal gate was observed at the outfall. The discharge point to the New Haven Harbor was also observed.
Hamden Public Library Backup Response Service Call	December 17, 2013	8, 9	The EPA Inspection Team observed the field crew’s response to a service call for a basement backup at the Hamden public library. Note that the blockage was determined to be within the lateral and was not the responsibility of the GNHWPCA; however, a courtesy sewer main line cleaning was conducted.
Boulevard Pump Station	December 17, 2013	10	Two, new, Duperon®, flex-ring bar screens, one for each inlet channel to the pump station, were being installed during the inspection. One of the bar screen had been installed and was undergoing final testing. One of four grit removal systems was in use; three were out of service for mechanical issues.

Wastewater Collection and Conveyance System Compliance Inspection
Greater New Haven Water Pollution Control Authority, Connecticut

Asset/Location	Date of Inspection	Photo Log Reference	Observations/Description
CSO Outfall 024	December 17, 2013	11	The CSO Outfall 024, which discharges to the New Haven Harbor, and associated outfall signage was observed during the inspection.
Truman CSO Storage Tank	December 17, 2013	12, 13	The EPA Inspection Team conducted a site visit to the Truman CSO Storage Tank, a CSO control facility constructed as part of the GNHWPCA's long-term efforts to control CSO discharges. The storage tank did not contain pump redundancy for the two cells, spare pumps and equipment were not readily available, and the CSO control facility was not configured with a portable or in-situ auxiliary power capabilities.
James Street Siphon and CSO Outfall 015	December 17, 2013	14	The signage associated with CSO Outfall 015 to the Quinnipiac River was not readily observed near the outfall location, which is also a popular fishing spot. GNHWPCA and CH2M Hill representatives stated that vandalism was an issue with the signage at this outfall.